



## Minutes IT Investment Board Meeting

**August 11, 2004**

### **Members Present:**

George C. Newstrom, Chairman,  
(ex-officio/voting)  
Jimmy Hazel  
Hiram Johnson

Scott Pattison  
Len Pomata  
Walter Kucharski (ex-officio/non-voting)

### **Members Absent:**

Chris Caine  
John Lee  
Jim McGuirk  
Dr. Mary Guy Miller

### **Others Present:**

The Honorable Mark R. Warner, Governor of Virginia  
Lem Stewart, Chief Information Officer of the Commonwealth  
JoAnn Maxwell, Office of the Attorney General

### **Call to Order**

The Chairman called the meeting of the Virginia Information Technology Investment Board to order at 10:05 a.m. He announced that the order of the agenda would be modified as there would be an unannounced visit by Governor Mark R. Warner. Upon his arrival, the audience would receive his remarks.

The role was called and four of the ten members were recorded as absent. Scott Pattison was enroute.

### **Approval of Minutes**

Hiram Johnson made a motion that the minutes of the July 7, 2004 meeting be approved. Jimmy Hazel seconded motion. There being no discussion, the minutes were approved as written.

## **ITIB Meeting Schedule**

Jerry Simonoff presented the ITIB/CIO VITA Mandatory Deliverables – Even Month Meetings Schedule, which was included in the Board members’ agenda packets. He stated that the diagram portrayed the annual cycle of Board meetings and key deliverables. At the July 7<sup>th</sup> meeting, the CIO had suggested that since the Board had decided to meet bi-monthly at the June Retreat, a proposed schedule be developed for meetings in the even calendar months.

Mr. Simonoff stated that a number of the items on the schedule were routine, and did not require a board meeting for action (i.e. Quarterly Reports). The even month schedule addresses several issues:

- With an even month schedule, the August meeting was called and provided an opportunity for detailed discussion regarding the September 1, 2004 Recommended Technology Investment Projects for the 2004-2006 Budget Biennium report due to the Governor and General Assembly.
- The Board can meet shortly after the end of the fiscal year, but far enough away from the July 1 date that the end of year reports can be presented for review.
- The Board will meet in early December in preparation for the upcoming General Assembly session.

Mr. Simonoff recommended that the Board meet on the dates provided during the even numbered months. The proposed dates fell on the second Wednesdays; however, it would not present a conflict if the Board chose to keep its 1<sup>st</sup> Wednesday of the month schedule.

Jimmy Hazel made a motion that the even month schedule be adopted as presented. Scott Pattison seconded the motion. There was no further discussion. The Board carried the motion with a vote of 5-0. The scheduled meetings are as follows:

Wed., October 13, 2004	Wed. February 9, 2005	Wed., June 8, 2005
Wed., December 8, 2004	Wed., April 13, 2005	

## **ITIB By-Laws Revision**

Jerry Simonoff referred the Board to the Comparison of Traditional and Electronic Meeting Requirements table included in the agenda packets. He stated that the basic difference between Method #1 and Method #2 was that Method #2 allowed for video conferences in which Board members not physically present would count as a quorum. He further stated that with either Method #1 or #2 there are critical requirements which must be followed. Of particular concern is the requirement that the meeting must stop if there is any interruption in the electronic method, audio or visual, until the difficulty is corrected so that all individuals at the remote sites can participate.

He commented that the insertion of procedures for conducting electronic meetings required additional changes in other sections of the By-Laws, namely, notification of meetings and other conduct of Board meetings. The amended by-laws (08/11/04) allow the ability to have both types of electronic meetings, at the Board’s discretion.

JoAnn Maxwell of the Attorney General's Office reiterated that Method #2 allowed for more flexibility, however, the Board must be mindful of the rigid requirements for each method. She stated that there are reporting requirements for the purpose of the General Assembly to see how the meetings were being utilized. In addition, there are notification requirements, which differ in Methods #1 and #2. For example, in Method #1, there is a 30-day notice requirement for emergency meetings; however, Method #2 has a shorter notice requirement and is contemporaneous with notices to members.

She stated that the reporting requirements had been incorporated into the By-laws, and the By-Laws should serve as a guide for holding electronic meetings.

Lem Stewart added that because of the integration with VDOT and all their video facilities, there is wide access to these facilities in northern Virginia, Roanoke, and across the state.

Chairman Newstrom inquired if the words "tele" conference and "video" conference were synonymous. JoAnn Maxwell responded that there are different requirements for "tele" vs. "video" conferences. In Method #2, the requirement is for a video conference; under Method #1, the Board could use either the telephone or video conference method.

Jerry Simonoff informed the Board that staff was prepared to present a demo of how teleconferencing would work. Chairman Newstrom stated that after the meeting, any Board member could view the demo, if so desired.

Jimmy Hazel made a motion to adopt the By-Law amendments dealing with the electronic meeting requirements for the ITIB. Hiram Johnson seconded the motion. The Board carried the motion with a vote of 5-0.

## **Recommended Technology Investment Projects (RTIP) Report to the Governor and General Assembly/Remarks by the Honorable Mark R. Warner, Governor of Virginia**

Governor Warner arrived shortly after the beginning of the RTIP presentation. He was introduced by the Chairman, and the Board and audience recognized the Governor with applause and standing ovation. The RTIP Report was suspended until after the Governor's remarks.

Chairman Newstrom expressed his appreciation to the Governor for addressing the ITIB. He stated that because of the Governor's direction and leadership role nationally, Virginia has made a radical transformation in technology, not just from a bits and bytes perspective, but from a business perspective. He further stated that both the Board and VITA are a culmination of the direction in technology received from the Governor. In addition to other recognitions, Virginia has moved from the bottom half of the ranking to number three in the country in the Digital State Survey.

Governor Warner commended the Board and the VITA team for the progress made thus far and challenged the Board and VITA staff to move the PPEA process forward, ensure successful

integration of large agencies to VITA, and elevate Virginia from third place to first place in the Digital States Survey.

He stated that the consolidation efforts under the CIO is essential to the long term prosperity and effectiveness of Virginia, not only in terms of state government operations, but also in terms of providing value to the taxpayers of Virginia. He also encouraged continued communication with the legislators to assist in converting the skepticism about the integration process, and thanked all who had taken a personal willingness to help bridge the gap. He emphasized that there needs to be ownership in the legislature so that the integration effort is not viewed as a Governor-driven initiative.

After the Governor's remarks, Judy Marchand proceeded with the presentation of the RTIP Report to the Governor and General Assembly.

Ms. Marchand stated that the Recommended Technology Investment Report is mandated by the Code of Virginia to be submitted to the Governor and the General Assembly by September 1<sup>st</sup> of each year and that under the Code there is specific project planning approval criteria used to evaluate projects to determine if they should be included on the list and approved for planning. The Project Management Division had worked very closely with agencies specifically to review and analyze all projects on their list to ensure they are classified appropriately.

Ms. Marchand reviewed the report preparation process and the evaluation criteria used in evaluating the projects that were approved by the IT Project Review Committee in March 2004. The 2004 RTIP Report scoring and priority ranking process were discussed, including the CIO review and ranking of the projects to apply additional enterprise thinking to the prioritization. Feedback received from the General Assembly staff, the Board, and Deputy Secretaries was discussed along with the new sections added to the Report in response to the feedback.

Discussion ensued regarding the report preparation process, the accuracy of the project cost estimations, PPEAs, and how project funding is identified via the budget process. After detailed discussion, Mr. Kucharski inquired of the Chair if it was appropriate for the ITIB to recommend in this Report that funded projects and the specific amounts funded be identified in the Appropriations Act so the legislature will be able to monitor all funded projects. Mr. Kucharski stated that the legislature needs to know how much to specifically fund for projects. The Report should put forward a recommendation as to how projects are identified. He stated that this may be done administratively.

Chairman Newstrom agreed that the Board should take this action.

Mr. Pomata and Mr. Johnson expressed concerns regarding the Board's role in active projects started prior to establishment of the Board, and how technology projects should be funded going forward. Possible changes to the budget process for funding technology projects, and specific language and recommendations for inclusion in the transmittal letter accompanying the report were suggested by various Board members.

Discussion continued on how the report development process could be refined and improved for next year and how the Report should become a budgeting document that makes clear, concise recommendations for next year's report were also discussed.

Jimmy Hazel made the following motion:

- *The ITIB approve the recommendations of the 2004 Recommended Technology Investment Projects (RTIP) Report as presented, with the following recommended funding priorities:*

*That the Governor and the General Assembly maintain funding for current active Major IT Projects contained in Appendix A of the RTIP Report, and*

*That the Governor and the General Assembly maintain and appropriate funds for the Priority Technology Investment Projects contained in Appendix B of the RTIP Report, and*

- *That the ITIB authorize the Chairman of the IT Investment Board to submit the RTIP Report, on behalf of the Board, to the Governor and General Assembly no later than September 1, 2004.*
- *And also to direct the CIO to address the issues in the transmittal letter to put the Governor and the General Assembly on notice that the process needs to be improved.*

Scott Pattison seconded the motion.

Scott Pattison concurred that getting the process in sync with the budget process would be extremely helpful. He stated that this will be reported through the Finance Committee. He also wanted to be sure that it is documented in the Report that "agency estimates" are specifically identified as "agency estimates." Hiram Johnson again stated that this should be included and emphasized in the Report and in the transmittal letter.

The Board carried the motion with a vote of 3-2.

Walter Kucharski suggested that a group of Board members work with the CIO to make proposals on how to modify the process for next year. Scott Pattison concurred. Mr. Pattison also stated that the group could look at the user-friendly aspect of the Report and how effective and influential its direct impact would be. Chairman Newstrom stated that he will work with Lem Stewart in pulling together a group of Board members to look at the process.

Ms. Marchand stated that the staffs of the General Assembly money committees and the Deputy Secretaries are also interested in participating in these discussions.

## **Other Business**

Chairman Newstrom stated because the vote was taken on the approval of the minutes before there was a full quorum of the Board, the motion needed to be retaken. Jimmy Hazel made a motion that the July 7<sup>th</sup> minutes be approved. Hiram Johnson seconded the motion. There was no discussion. The Board carried the motion with a vote of 5-0. The minutes were approved as submitted.

Chairman Newstrom encouraged reservations be made to attend COVITS. The entire Board has been invited, and the Governor will be in attendance both Sunday and Monday.

## **Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

## **Adjourn**

A motion was made by Jimmy Hazel to adjourn. Hiram Johnson seconded the motion. The next meeting of the ITIB will be Wednesday, October 13, 2004. Time and location will be announced. There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12:00 noon.